Multivariate Statistics in Ecology and Quantitative Genetics 10. Quantitative Traits Loci (QTL) Mapping

Dirk Metzler & Martin Hutzenthaler

http://evol.bio.lmu.de/_statgen

1. June 2010

(日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日)

Contents

Introduction Crossing Schemes QTL model assumptions

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ □ のQ@

Single-QTL analysis

LOD score Interval mapping



▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ = 三 のへで

Introduction

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ - 三 - のへぐ

Contents

Introduction Crossing Schemes QTL model assumptions

Single-QTL analysis

LOD score Interval mapping

Contents

Introduction Crossing Schemes

QTL model assumptions

Single-QTL analysis

LOD score Interval mapping







intercrosses

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ = 三 のへで



Introduction QTL model assumptions

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ - 三 - のへぐ

Contents

Introduction Crossing Schemes QTL model assumptions

Single-QTL analysis

LOD score Interval mapping

Assume that *p* sites have an influence on the quantitative trait *y* of interest and denote an individual's genotype at these sites by $g = (g_1, g_2, \dots, g_p)$

$$\mu_g := \mathbb{E}(y|g)$$

 $\sigma_g^2 := \operatorname{var}(y|g)$
we assume: $y|g \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_g, \sigma_g^2)$
additive model: $\mu_g = \mu + \sum_{j=1}^p z_j \cdot \Delta_j$,

whereas z_j is 0 or 1 according to the genotype of g_j , and Δ_j is the effect of the QTL at position *j*.

In a strict sense, *epistasis* means that the effect of a mutation can be masked by a mutation at a different loci.

However, in the context of QTL mapping, the word epistasis if often used to express that there is a non-additive interaction between two loci. In a strict sense, *epistasis* means that the effect of a mutation can be masked by a mutation at a different loci.

However, in the context of QTL mapping, the word epistasis if often used to express that there is a non-additive interaction between two loci.

Main problem: We do not know where the QTLs are. We only have genetic markers to determine for several sites whether the stem from A or B.

(ロ) (同) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

Single-QTL analysis

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ - 三 - のへぐ

Contents

Introduction Crossing Schemes QTL model assumptions

Single-QTL analysis

LOD score Interval mapping

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □

Contents

ntroduction Crossing Schemes QTL model assumptions

Single-QTL analysis LOD score Interval mapping

Assume a backcross experiment with *n* F2 individuals Let $y = (y_1, ..., y_n)$ be their phenotypes for the trait of interest.

< □ > < 同 > < 三 > < 三 > < 三 > < ○ < ○ </p>

Null hypothesis H_0 : no QTL Residual sum of squares under H_0 :

$$\text{RSS}_0 = \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \bar{y})^2$$

Very simple alternative H_1 : single QTL at marker position *i*

$$m{y}_i | m{g}_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{m{g}_i}, \sigma^2)$$

Likelihood function:

$$L_1(\mu_{AA}, \mu_{AB}, \sigma^2) = \Pr(y | \text{QTL marker}, \mu_{AA}, \mu_{AB}, \sigma^2)$$

= $\prod_{i=1}^n \phi(y_i; \mu_{g_i}, \sigma^2),$

whereas ϕ is the density of the normal distribution.

The maximal likelihood under H_1 is $RSS_1^{-n/2}$, with

$$\mathrm{RSS}_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n \left(y_i - \widehat{\mu_{g_i}} \right)^2.$$

The LOD score is the \log_{10} of the likelihood ratio of H_1 and H_0 :

$$\mathsf{LOD} = rac{n}{2} \mathsf{log}_{10} \left(rac{\mathsf{RSS}_0}{\mathsf{RSS}_1} \right)$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆ □▶ ◆ □▶ ─ □ ─ の < @

The LOD score is traditionally used in QTL mapping. However, it is equivalent to the classical anova *F*-statistic:

$$\mathsf{F} = \frac{(\mathsf{RSS}_0 - \mathsf{RSS}_1)/\mathsf{df}}{\mathsf{RSS}_1/(n - \mathsf{df} - 1)} = (10^{2 \cdot \mathsf{LOD}/n} - 1) \cdot \frac{n - \mathsf{df} - 1}{\mathsf{df}}$$

$$LOD = \frac{n}{2}\log_{10}\left(\frac{F \cdot df}{n - df + 1} + 1\right)$$

So, if the marker positions are our our candidates for the QTLs we just perform anovas.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ● ● ● ●

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ = 三 のへで

Contents

Introduction Crossing Schemes QTL model assumptions

Single-QTL analysis LOD score Interval mapping

The QTLs may be between the marker positions, and their genotypes can only be estimated from the markers.

- The QTLs may be between the marker positions, and their genotypes can only be estimated from the markers.
- Let M_i be the multipoint marker genotype and g_i be the QTL genotype of individual i, and

$$p_{ij} := \Pr(g_i = j | M_i).$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆□▶ ● ● ● ●

(Computation uses recombination rates.)

- The QTLs may be between the marker positions, and their genotypes can only be estimated from the markers.
- Let M_i be the multipoint marker genotype and g_i be the QTL genotype of individual i, and

$$p_{ij} := \Pr(g_i = j | M_i).$$

(Computation uses recombination rates.)

Probability density of an individual's phenotype is a mixture of normal distribution densities:

$$\sum_{j} p_{ij} \cdot \phi(\mathbf{y}_i; \mu_j, \sigma^2)$$

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● のへで

EM algorithm for ML-estimation of μ_j and σ Start with initial estimates $\mu_j^{(0)}$ and $\sigma^{(0)}$ and iterate the following steps for s = 1, ..., N:

E-step

$$w_{ij}^{(s)} := \Pr(g_i = j | M_i, y_i, \mu_j^{(s-1)}, \sigma^{(s-1)})$$

=
$$\frac{p_{ij}\phi(y_i; \mu_j^{(s-1)}, \sigma^{(s-1)})}{\sum_k p_{ik}\phi(y_i; \mu_k^{(s-1)}, \sigma^{(s-1)})}$$

M-step

$$\begin{array}{lcl} \mu_{j}^{(s)} & := & \sum_{i} w_{ij}^{(s)} y_{i} / \sum_{i} w_{ij}^{(s)} \\ \sigma^{(s)} & := & \sqrt{\sum_{ij} w_{ij}^{(s)} (y_{i} - \mu_{j}^{(s)})^{2} / n} \end{array}$$

◆□ ▶ ◆□ ▶ ◆ □ ▶ ◆ □ ▶ ● □ ● ● ● ●

The aim of the EM algorithm is that $\mu_j^{(s)}$ and $\sigma^{(s)}$ converge against the ML estimators $\hat{\mu}$ and $\hat{\sigma}$.

< □ > < 同 > < 三 > < 三 > < 三 > < ○ < ○ </p>

The aim of the EM algorithm is that $\mu_j^{(s)}$ and $\sigma^{(s)}$ converge against the ML estimators $\hat{\mu}$ and $\hat{\sigma}$.

Then, the LOD score can be computed:

$$\mathsf{LOD} = \mathsf{log}_{10} \left(\frac{\prod_i \sum_j p_{ij} \phi(\mathbf{y}_i; \widehat{\mu}_j, \widehat{\sigma}^2)}{\prod_i \phi(\mathbf{y}_i; \widehat{\mu}_0, \widehat{\sigma}^2_0)} \right)$$

(日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日)

Sometimes EM can be very slow.

Haley-Knott (HK) regression is a fast approximation: For each point *i* on the grid calculate $p_{ij} = \Pr(g_i = j | M_i)$ and estimate μ_i and σ by fitting a linear model

$$\mathbf{y}_i | \mathbf{M}_i \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\sum_j \mathbf{p}_{ij} \mu_j, \sigma^2\right)$$

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ - 三■ - のへぐ

Sometimes EM can be very slow.

Haley-Knott (HK) regression is a fast approximation: For each point *i* on the grid calculate $p_{ij} = \Pr(g_i = j | M_i)$ and estimate μ_i and σ by fitting a linear model

$$\mathbf{y}_i | \mathbf{M}_i \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\sum_j \mathbf{p}_{ij} \mu_j, \sigma^2\right)$$

Extended Haley-Knott (EHK) regression: Takes into account that p_{ij} and μ_j have an influence on the variance:

$$m{y}_i | m{M}_i \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\sum_j m{p}_{ij} \mu_j, \sum_j m{p}_{ij} \mu_j^2 - \left(\sum_j m{p}_{ij} \mu_j\right)^2 + \sigma^2
ight)$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 三臣 - のへで

Single-QTL analysis Interval mapping

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆ □▶ ◆ □▶ ● □ ● ● ● ●

Which LOD scores are significant?

Single-QTL analysis Interval mapping

Which LOD scores are significant?

Assess this by a permutation test: shuffle the phenotype column.



More than one QTL

Contents

ntroduction Crossing Schemes QTL model assumptions

Single-QTL analysis

Interval mapping

More than one QTL

▲ロト▲御ト▲臣と▲臣と 臣 のへで

More than one QTL

Composite Interval Mapping While searching for a QTL in one interval use other markers as proxies for nearby QTLs. Thus, markers are used as covariates. Specify maximal number of covariates and how far they should be away from the interval under examination.

two-QTL models search for interacting pairs of QTLs. Same methods like in 1-QTL model: EM, HK, EHK

multiple QTLs When candidate loci are found, fit regression models allowing for interactions and do variable selection.

(ロ) (同) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)